



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,053	04/15/2004	Eric Martin	2003P08954 US01	9437
7590		09/03/2008	EXAMINER	
Alexander J. Burke			GREENE, JOSEPH L.	
Intellectual Property Department			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5th Floor			2151	
170 Wood Avenue South			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
Iselin, NJ 08830			09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/826,053	Applicant(s) MARTIN ET AL.
	Examiner JOSEPH L. GREENE	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/23/2008

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 19 are currently pending in this application.
2. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-17 are amended as filed on 06/09/2008.

Claim Objections

3. The following claims is objected to for improper use of grammar.
 - (a) Claim 1 contains the limitation "said said URL link."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-11 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2003/0063119), hereinafter Bloomfield, in view of Joseph (Patent No. US 6,038,603).**

6. With respect to claim 1, Bloomfield disclosed a system employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application for initiating an action by a second non-web enabled executable application, comprising: a web browser compatible executable application (abstract, lines 3-7) and a communication processor, coupled to said URL

link interpreter, for initiating communication of said extracted context information and action request identifier to said second executable application by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication (0009, lines 1-5, where the resizing event is a communication and a communication processor is present to carry out the aforementioned function. Also, section 0008, lines 16-19, where the second virtual channel is the second mode of communication). However, Bloomfield did not explicitly state employing a URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application; a URL link interpreter, coupled to said URL processor via a first mode of communication, for identifying said particular format URL link, for extracting said context information and action request identifier from said particular format URL link, and for initiating termination of the first mode of communication.

On the other hand, Joseph did teach employing a URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application (column 3, lines 41-43 and column 4, lines 1-9, where the URL must be in a predetermined format in order for the system to function properly. Furthermore, the operation is the action request and the target that is identified is the context information); a URL link interpreter, coupled to said URL processor via a first mode of communication (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of

communication with respect to URL processing. Furthermore, the device that carries out the Retrieve Operation Protocol Key step is a URL link interpreter), for identifying said particular format URL link, for extracting said context information and action request identifier from said particular format URL link, and for initiating termination of the first mode of communication (column 3, lines 53-63, where a means to interpret the URL is required to perform the referenced functions).

Both of the system of Bloomfield and Joseph are directed towards manipulating a secondary application, from a primary application, via a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Bloomfield to utilize URL commands/links, as taught by Joseph, as a means of communicating, using common internet technology, without implementing the cost and complexity of creating a personal communication protocol from the ground up.

7. As for claim 2, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Bloomfield taught wherein said first mode of communication comprises at least one of, (a) Internet compatible communication and (b) Hyper Text Transfer Protocol communication (0019, lines 5-10, where this reference taught the internet communication); and Joseph Taught wherein said second mode of communication comprises at least one of, (i) Microsoft Windows compatible message communication, (ii) socket communication, and (iii) COM communication (column 2,

lines 34-39, where a machine port is a socket and the listed port value is referring to the socket i.e. socket communication).

8. As for claim 3, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Joseph taught wherein said URL link interpreter initiates said termination of the first mode of communication by cancelling navigation to the address indicated in said URL link having said predetermined particular format (column 3, lines 53-63, where by definition, terminating a communication means that one no longer communicates. i.e. no longer navigating to the cancellation address).

9. As for claim 4, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Bloomfield taught wherein said user command is received via a displayed web page; and said URL processor sets a location property of a browser window object to an address (0009, lines 7-10 and abstract, lines 3-7, where resizing the application is setting a location property).

10. As for claim 5, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Joseph taught wherein: said context information comprises at least one of, (a) a user identifier, (b) a patient identifier, (c) a customer identifier, (d) a source identifier, (e) a destination identifier, (f) a password, (g) a computer operational session identifier, (h) an identifier identifying said non-web

enabled executable application to perform said user command and (i) a data identifier (column 4, lines 6-9, where the target is the destination identifier); and Bloomfield taught wherein said action request identifier identifies at least one of, (i) a type of action to be performed by said non-web enabled application, (ii) a type of said user command, (iii) an event and (iv) an authentication service (0009, lines 1-5, where resizing is an action that was requested).

11. With respect to claim 6, Bloomfield disclosed a web browser system for receiving and processing application information associated with an action performed by a non-web enabled executable application, comprising: a web browser compatible executable application (abstract, lines 3-7) for initiating termination of a first mode of communication (0008, lines 16-19), initiating communication of extracted context information and action request identifier received from a web browser compatible executable application to a non-web enabled executable application (0009, lines 1-5, where the resizing is a function of the aforementioned limitations) by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication (0008, lines 16-19, where the second virtual channel is the second mode of communication); receiving application data from said non-web enabled executable application in response to said action request identifier (0009, lines 10-15); parsing document object data associated with a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing the received application data to be compatible with said web browser compatible executable application (0009, lines 1-5, 7-10, where the parsing of the object allows the

Art Unit: 2151

application to be resized); and initiating execution of the identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said interface processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser compatible executable application (0009, lines 1-5, where detecting a resize event is detecting the process being received)

However, Bloomfield did not explicitly state receiving a URL link having a particular format via a first mode of communication , identifying said URL link having said particular format, extracting context information and an action request identifier from said URL link having said particular format. On the other hand, Joseph did teach receiving a URL link having a particular format via a first mode of communication (column 3, lines 50-53), identifying said URL link having said particular format, extracting context information and an action request identifier from said URL link having said particular format (column 3, lines 41-43 and column 4, lines 1-9, where the URL must be in a predetermined format in order for the system to function properly. Furthermore, the operation is the action request and the target that is identified is the context information). Both of the system of Bloomfield and Joseph are directed towards manipulating a secondary application, from a primary application, via a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Bloomfield to utilize URL commands/links, as taught by Joseph, as a means of communicating, using common internet technology, without implementing the cost and complexity of creating a personal communication protocol from the ground up.

12. As for claim 7, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 6. In addition, Bloomfield taught a system according to claim 6, wherein said application data comprises at least one of (a) a command identifier, (b) data and (c) status information associated with an action performed by said non-web enabled executable application (0009, lines 1-5, where resizing was triggered by a command identifier).

13. As for claim 8, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 7. In addition, Bloomfield taught wherein said document object data comprises a document object model associated with a web page (0009, lines 7-10).

14. As for claim 9, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 8. In addition, Bloomfield taught wherein said web page is represented by data comprising at least one of, (a) HTML compatible data, (v) XML compatible data and (c) SGML compatible data (0027, lines 1-9).

15. As for claim 10, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 6. In addition, Bloomfield taught a communication processor, coupled to said interface processor, for communicating with said non-web enabled executable application to acquire said application data (0009, lines 1-5, where

the resizing event is a communication and a communication processor is present to carry out the aforementioned function).

16. As for claim 11, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10. In addition, Joseph taught wherein said communication processor communicates with said non-web enabled executable application by at least one of, (i) Microsoft Windows compatible message communication, (ii) socket communication, and (iii) COM communication (column 2, lines 34-39, where a machine port is a socket and the listed port value is referring to the socket i.e. socket communication).

17. With respect to claim 17, Bloomfield disclosed a method for receiving and processing application information associated with an action performed by an executable application, comprising: a web browser compatible executable application (abstract, lines 3-7) for initiating termination of a first mode of communication (0008, lines 16-19), initiating communication of extracted context information and action request identifier received from a web browser compatible executable application to a non-web enabled executable application (0009, lines 1-5, where the resizing is a function of the aforementioned limitations) by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication (0008, lines 16-19, where the second virtual channel is the second mode of communication); receiving application data from said non-web enabled executable application in response to a user command entered

via a displayed browser image (0007, All, where the user is the one entering the information); parsing document object data associated with a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing the received application data to be compatible with said web browser compatible executable application (0009, lines 1-5, 7-10, where the parsing of the object allows the application to be resized); and initiating execution of the identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said interface processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser compatible application (0009, lines 1-5, where detecting a resize event is detecting the process being received)

However, Bloomfield did not explicitly state receiving a URL link having a particular format via a first mode of communication , identifying said URL link having said particular format, extracting context information and an action request identifier from said URL link having said particular format. On the other hand, Joseph did teach receiving a URL link having a particular format via a first mode of communication (column 3, lines 50-53), identifying said URL link having said particular format, extracting context information and an action request identifier from said URL link having said particular format (column 3, lines 41-43 and column 4, lines 1-9, where the URL must be in a predetermined format in order for the system to function properly. Furthermore, the operation is the action request and the target that is identified is the context information). Both of the system of Bloomfield and Joseph are directed towards manipulating a secondary application, from a primary application, via a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time

of the invention, to modify the teachings of Bloomfield to utilize URL commands/links, as taught by Joseph, as a means of communicating, using common internet technology, without implementing the cost and complexity of creating a personal communication protocol from the ground up.

18. As for claim 18, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitation described in claim 17. In addition, Joseph taught the activity of updating a local storage location in response to received application data (column 5, lines 54-60).

19. As for claim 19, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitation described in claim 18. In addition, Bloomfield taught at least one of the activities of: requesting data; performing a procedure; and responding to a command from a web enabled application as a result of a change in status of said web browser compatible executable application (0009, lines 1-5, where resizing the window is performing a procedure).

20. **Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomfield, in view of Joseph, and in further view of Wang et al. (Patent No. US 7,200,683 B1), hereinafter Wang.**

21. As for claim 12, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 10. In addition, Bloomfield taught information being

transferred from a web enabled application to a non-web enabled application (abstract, lines 3-7), but Bloomfield did not explicitly state wherein said communication processor establishes non-polling communication with said non-web enabled executable application and said non-web enabled executable application provides said status information to said communication processor in response to at least one of (i) a command by said non-web enabled executable application and (ii) a request from said communication processor. However, Wang did teach wherein said communication processor establishes non-polling communication with an executable application and said executable application provides status information (column 5, lines 64-67) to said communication processor in response to at least one of (i) a command by said non-web enabled executable application and (ii) a request from said communication processor (column 5, lines 21-24, where this section explains the operation of the communication processor).

The systems of Bloomfield, Joseph, and Wang are related to interfaces for controlling foreign devices/applications that are not web-enabled and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph, to have status information transferred/returned, as taught by Wang, in order to have a system that is more aware of the particular states of the system in which it's controlling; Thus, improving the efficiency of the management.

22. As for claim 13, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 7, but the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph did not explicitly state displaying the received status information. However, Wang did teach displaying the received status information (column 5, lines 50-54, 64-67, where the returned status information is displayed in the GUI). The systems of Bloomfield, Joseph, and Wang are related to interfaces for controlling foreign devices/applications that are not web-enabled and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph, to have status information transferred/returned, as taught by Wang, in order to have a system that is more aware of the particular states of the system in which it's controlling; Thus, improving the efficiency of the management.

23. As for claim 14, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph disclosed all of the limitations described in claim 7, but the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph did not explicitly state wherein received status information includes at least one of, (a) an identifier identifying status of performance of a task by said non-web enabled executable application, (b) a status description and (c) a text message. However, Wang did teach wherein received status information includes at least one of, (a) an identifier identifying status of performance of a task by said non-web enabled executable application, (b) a status description and (c) a text message (column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 2, where the state information is a status description).

24. With respect to claim 15, Bloomfield disclosed Joseph a system employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application for initiating an action by a non-web enabled executable application, but Bloomfield did not explicitly state the system comprising: a URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by an executable application; a URL link interpreter, coupled to said URL processor via a first mode of communication for identifying said URL in said predetermined particular format, for extracting said context information and action request identifier from said URL in said predetermined particular format, and for initiating termination of the first mode of communication; and a communication processor, coupled to said URL link interpreter, for initiating communication of said extracted context information and action request identifier to said second executable application by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication.

However, Joseph did teach the system comprising: a URL processor for generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by an executable application (column 3, lines 53-63); a URL link interpreter, coupled to said URL processor via a first mode of communication (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of communication with respect to URL processing), for identifying said URL in said predetermined particular format, for

extracting said context information and action request identifier from said URL in said predetermined particular format, and for initiating termination of the first mode of communication (column 3, lines 64-67); and a communication processor, coupled to said URL link interpreter, for initiating communication of said extracted context information (column 4, lines 1-9) and action request identifier to said second executable application by a second mode of communication different from said first mode of communication (fig. 10 describes the second mode of communication dealing with the transferring of the data). Both of the system of Bloomfield and Joseph are directed towards manipulating a secondary application, from a primary application, via a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of Bloomfield to utilize URL commands/links, as taught by Joseph, as a means of communicating, using common internet technology, without implementing the cost and complexity of creating a personal communication protocol from the ground up.

On the other hand, the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph did not explicitly state acquiring status information or a system employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application for receiving status information associated with an action performed by a second executable application, comprising: an interface processor for: receiving application data from said second executable application in response to a user command entered via a displayed image; parsing document object data associated with said displayed image to find a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing said received application data to be

Art Unit: 2151

compatible with a web browser application; and initiating execution of said identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said interface processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser application.

On the other hand, Wang did teach acquiring status information (column 5, lines 64-67) and Wang also discloses a system employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application (column 8, lines 21-32) for receiving status information (column 5, lines 64-67, where the server device's application is the second executable application) associated with an action performed by a second executable application (column 5, lines 21-24, the service control program in the application device is the second executable application), comprising: an interface processor for: receiving application data from said second executable application in response to a user command entered via a displayed image (column 8, lines 55-57; column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 5; and column 5, lines 64-67, the latter reference shows the connection between the executable application software and the web based application); parsing document object data associated with said displayed image to find a predetermined procedure identifier identifying an executable procedure for processing said received application data to be compatible with a web browser application (column 10, lines 32-36, this section shows the use of GUI style objects such as icons and text boxes and etc. that are object based. Thus when they are pressed, their object data is parsed in order for them to perform their actions; column 9, lines 21-25, the HTTP protocol will allow the device to communicate with the web browser); and initiating execution of said identified executable procedure, in response to a command from said interface

processor, to provide processed received application data to said web browser application (column 5, lines 64-67, i.e. receiving status info based on request).

The systems of Bloomfield, Joseph, and Wang are related to interfaces for controlling foreign devices/applications that are not web-enabled and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill, in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the teachings of the combination of Bloomfield and Joseph, to have status information transferred/returned, as taught by Wang, in order to have a system that is more aware of the particular states of the system in which it's controlling; Thus, improving the efficiency of the management.

25. With respect to claim 16, Bloomfield disclosed a method employed by at least one web browser compatible executable application for initiation an action by a non-web enabled executable application (abstract, lines 3-7), Comprising the activities of initiating communication of context information and action request identifier to said non-web enabled executable application by a second mode of communication different from a first mode of communication (0009, lines 1-5, where the resizing event is a communication and a communication processor is present to carry out the aforementioned function. Also, section 0008, lines 16-19, where the second virtual channel is the second mode of communication), but Bloomfield did not explicitly state generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application initiating

communication of said URL link in a first mode of communication; identifying the particular format link; extracting said context information and action request identifier from said particular format link; and initiating termination of said first mode of communication.

However, Joseph did teach generating, in response to a user command, a URL link in a predetermined particular format including context information and an action request identifier, the URL link representing an action to be performed by said second executable application (column 3, lines 41-43 and column 4, lines 1-9, where the URL must be in a predetermined format in order for the system to function properly. Furthermore, the operation is the action request and the target that is identified is the context information); initiating communication of said URL link in a first mode of communication (Fig. 9 discuses the first mode of communication with respect to URL processing. Furthermore, the device that carries out the Retrieve Operation Protocol Key step is a URL link interpreter); identifying the particular format link; extracting said context information and action request identifier from said particular format link (column 3, lines 41-43 and column 4, lines 1-9, where being able to identify the format is necessary for the system to function accurately/properly); and initiating termination of said first mode of communication (column 3, lines 53-63, where by definition, terminating a communication means that one no longer communicates).

Both of the system of Bloomfield and Joseph are directed towards manipulating a secondary application, from a primary application, via a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to

modify the teachings of Bloomfield to utilize URL commands/links, as taught by Joseph, as a means of communicating, using common internet technology, without implementing the cost and complexity of creating a personal communication protocol from the ground up.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH L. GREENE whose telephone number is

(571)270-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLG

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151